

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ANTONY LAMAR
BATCHELOR, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED
November 21, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KAREN BATCHELOR,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 267723
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 03-425679-NA

Before: White, P.J., and Zahra, and Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (i). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

The evidence clearly demonstrated that respondent was unable and unwilling to rectify the conditions that brought the child into care. Although respondent admitted that her home was still unsuitable for Antony, she would not allow the workers into her home to inspect it, and she would not request any assistance because she did not want to fill out any paperwork releasing her personal information. Respondent stated that she was unable to care for the child without her mother's help. However, the psychologist determined that respondent's mother was an unfit caretaker for Antony because of her paranoid and delusional thinking. In addition, respondent's mother had threatened the foster care workers assigned to the case and tried to see the child at his foster care home and his school in defiance of court orders. Moreover, the trial court had suspended her visitation because of Antony's violent behavior after the visits. In spite of this, respondent would not separate herself from her mother and did not attend any visits with Antony

after the trial court suspended her mother's visitation. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Helene N. White

/s/ Brian K. Zahra

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly